DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 017 CS 507 419

AUTHOR Aitken, Joan E.
TITLE Teaching Interpersonal Communication through an Analysis of Students' Initial Interaction: A Q-Methodological Study of Styles in Meeting People.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Communication Association (Chicago, IL, April 11-14, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Body Language; College Students; Communication Research; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Communication; *Personality Assessment; Personality Measures; *Personality Traits; Q Methodology; Rapport; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Styles; Q Statistic

ABSTRACT

A study categorized self-perceptions of subjects regarding their feelings about initial communication interaction. Using Q-Technique, a total of 138 subjects, mostly students at a midsized, midwestern, urban university enrolled in interpersonal communication courses, were studied through the use of two structured Q-sorts containing statements about nonverbal communication, verbal communication, physical setting, social setting, and decisionmaking. The development of the measure was used as a means of teaching students about interaction and context in the initial stage of relational development. Results indicated there were six communicator styles: (1) the "tentative communicator" who is rhetorically sensitive; (2) the "deliberate communicator" who thinks he or she makes definitive judgments about first impressions; (3) the "searching communicator" who is apprehensive; (4) the "open communicator" who is nonjudgmental; (5) the "particular communicator" who is critically judgmental; and (6) the "awkward communicator" who is caring but lacks skills. (Two tables of data are included; 51 references are attached.) (Author/TD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330017

Teaching Interpersonal Communication through an Analysis of Students' Initial Interaction: A Q-Methodological Study of Styles in Meeting People

Joan E. Aitken
University of Missouri-Kansas City

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Communication Association, Chicago, April 11, 1991.

Author Identification: Joan E. Aitken (Ed.D. University of Arkansas, 1985) is an Assistant Professor, Department of Communication Studies, University of Missouri--Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri 64110-2499, telephone (816) 235-1698.

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to categorize the self-perceptions of subjects regarding their feelings about initial communication interaction. Using Q-Technique, a total of 138 subjects were studied through the use of two structured Q-sorts containing statements about nonverbal communication, verbal communication, physical setting, social setting, and decision-making. There were six communicator styles: the "tentative communicator" who is rhetorically sensitive, the "deliberate communicator" who thinks he or she makes definitive judgments about first impressions, the "searching communicator" who is apprehensive, the "open communicator" who is nonjudgmental, the "particular communicator" who is critically judgmental, and "the awkward communicator" who is caring but lacks skills.

CS507419

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan Aitken
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Everyone reacts differently when first meeting another person. For some people, initial interaction is awkward. For others, it provides a pleasant opportunity to meet new people. In the initiating stage of relationships, individuals meet each other and make the decision whether to continue the relationship (Knapp, 1984). That initial interaction is characterized by ritualized, phatic communication. There is little self-disclosure, topics tend to be general in nature, and conversation amounts to little more than "small talk." In addition, initial interaction is characterized by rules of politeness and turn-taking (Nofsinger, 1975). Although there has been considerable study of initial interaction, most research has focused on how people are attracted to others and the nature of their interaction during those first steps of relationship formation. Early research on rituals (Goffman, 1971; Krivonos and Knapp, 1975) and turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1978) built the foundation for current knowledge about initial interaction. Of the factors used in determining interpersonal attraction, perceived similarity (Sunnafrank & Miller, 1981; Suman & Sethi, 1985; Sunnafrank, 1985) and the interpersonal goals perspective (Sunnafrank, 1986) have provided insight. Some researchers have found that in the face of contradictory information, one's first impression may be the most influential in determining whether or not to trust an individual (Quigley-Fernandez, Malkis, & Tedeschi, 1985). An additional dimension--communication apprehension--(Richmond & McCroskey, 1985) also has shed light on the interaction that transpires when people first meet.

One area of study that seems to be ignored is that of communicator style in initial interaction. Some researchers have used a styles approach to communication analysis. If individuals tend to use certain patterns in communication, identification of these patterns may be useful. If there are general or characteristic differences in approaches between individuals, these may indicate typologies. So, one may wonder whether or not there are different styles of initial interaction. If different styles exist, what are the behaviors of an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

individual who is comfortable and effective at initial interaction? This study sought to use a research method that would combine the quantitative and qualitative approaches in examining the subjective nature of meeting people. The investigation examined and described the self-perceptions of subjects regarding their feelings during the initial interaction phase of interpersonal communication.

Influences on Style of Initial Interaction

Researchers have identified different communicator styles in various contexts. Norton (1978, 1983), for example, identified specific communicator styles and their verbal and nonverbal manifestations. In addition, several individual styles in dealing with conflict, for example, have been identified (Tutzauer and Roloff, 1988). Fitzpatrick's line of research stands as evidence of communicator style in marriage and other relationships (Fitzpatrick, 1984; Fitzpatrick, Jandt, Myrick, Edgar, 1990). Identification of styles has provided communication scholars a method of examining interaction. Considering the importance of rhetorical sensitivity, for example, by identifying specific communication style, an individual can learn new behaviors to increase his or her adaptability (Hart, Carlson, Eadie, 1980). Given the importance of adaptation through rhetorical sensitivity, identification of communication styles may be useful in helping one determine whether he or she is using a typical or adaptive style. Further, although many researchers have identified styles, their research is in a specific context rather than a specific stage of relational development. Bormann (1980), for example, used a styles approach to the context of communication in looking at the rules, customs and conventions in our rhetorical communities. Gorden, Infante, and Braun (1986) examined communicator style related to fashion. Infante and Gorden (1981) studied communicator style in organizations. Such styles may or may not apply to the unique stage of initial interaction.

The literature related to initial interaction can be grouped into four general categories: verbal communication, nonverbal communication, context, and decision-making. These categories provided the foundation for the measure developed in this study. First, the verbal communication influences initial interaction from the standpoint of what

is said and how it is said. The verbal aspect seems to be one of the first areas of communication research related to initial interaction. Brewer and Brewer (1968), for example, established the importance of verbal content in messages in their study of the use of verbal rewards and balance of interaction. Other early research indicated the importance of verbal communication in helping interactants to determine the amount of attitude similarly they have (Byrne, 1961), and on topic selection and perception of attitudes on a given topic in influencing attraction (e.g. Byrne and Blaylock, 1963; Clore and Baldridge, 1968). More recently, Kleinke, Meeker, & Staneski (1986) demonstrated the significance of verbal interaction in their study of opening lines used by men and women when meeting someone of the opposite sex.

Impression formation is influenced by one's personality and social skills, leading subjects to indicate those who are extroverted and nonverbally skilled make the most favorable impressions on others (Riggio and Friedman, 1986). The importance of nonverbal elements in human interaction has long been established, leading some researchers to study the specific elements that provide information and stimulus to one's interpretation of the other in initial interaction. The findings of Maxwell and Cook (1985), for example, imply that people are influenced by postural congruence in determining similarity and liking during initial interaction. Harrigan (1985) studied the role of body movements related to turn-taking in conversation, an important part of impression formation. In pairs of strangers, Bull and Connelly (1985) found that body movements indicate emphasis and meaning in conversation.

The physical and social context of a meeting may influence initial interaction from the standpoint of ease of communication and information about the people involved. Gifford (1981), for example, considered the setting in sociability. Social context enables communicators to gather cues from a variety of sources, such as the impressions generated by companions, the social event producing the meeting, and expectancies.

Part of the decision-making process when meeting people may revolve around one's perception of the other individual, such as the way one is perceived as different, strange, or unfamiliar (Gurevitch, 1988). Although research has supported the idea that people can accurately determine how their impressions are perceived over time, they may not be

accurate in determining their likability or competence as perceived by different people (DePaulo, Hoover, Webb, Kenny, & Oliver, 1987). Rodin (1982) believed that we use "dislike" and "disregard criteria" to eliminate people from potential relationships.

These general areas of research related to initial interaction stimulated a styles approach to the the present study. The questions that guided the research were as follows:

RQ1: Are there different communicator styles in the initial interaction stage of relational development?

RQ2: Do the general categories of verbal communication, nonverbal communication, context, and decision-making account for the nature of initial interaction?

Method

Although there are many ways available to categorize interpersonal communication, the general method used here was to look at interaction (verbal and nonverbal) and context (social and physical). Q-methodology was used because of its ability to determine person-types, and because it is theoretically based on the importance of communicability. As people talk about a given subject, their concourse of statements defines the nature of that subject. Stephenson, (1986b) indicated that "Q is based on communication and meaning as reflected in the concourse." By interviewing people and acquiring statements from their common language, the researcher has a vehicle that manifests our culture. In this Q concourse of statements, not only was interaction and context revealed, but the concourse reflected another category--decision-making--that related to making judgments about initial interaction.

Subjects. The data was collected from volunteers between 1988-1991. The majority of subjects were students enrolled in interpersonal communication courses at a midsized, midwestern, urban university. The others were included to add diverstiy to the examination, and they were friends and family of the students. A pilot study was conducted with 50 subjects. The measure was modified and repeated with an additional 88 subjects (34 males and 54 females, aged 19-54, 12% ethnic minority). This number of subjects is consistent with appropriate use of Q-methodology (Casey & Graham, 1988; Stephen, 1985, p. 193).

Apparatus. The general procedure in developing the measure was as follows. First, hundreds of statements were collected (Casey & Graham, 1988, p. 3) through the author's interviewing of the pilot group and the students' subsequent interviewing of their families and friends about their perceptions of the process of meeting people. The development of the measure was used as a means of teaching students about interaction and context in the initial stage of relational development. To create the initial instrument, 15 undergraduate student volunteers conducted interviews to collect statements for the Q concourse. Students were taught interviewing techniques and the basic tenets of Q-methodology. By examining the nature of these statements, patterns of statement content were categorized, from which a random sample was drawn. The general categories for constructing the measure were the same as those indicated above--verbal communication, nonverbal communication, physical context, social context, and decision making. Those statements provided a pilot instrument of 52 items.

Second, an additional ten student volunteers conducted interviews for new statements for the final 53 statement Q sort (see Appendix A). After the pilot study, consensus items and statements that generated confusion among some respondents were replaced by statements from the new Q concourse collected by the second group of students. This final 53 statement Q-sort fell within the parameters of most Q-sorts (Brown, 1987b, p. 98; Brown, 1986a, p. 59). "The key, as Stephenson has pointed out, is in the diversity of the concourse and in the Q sample which models it" (Brown, 1986c).

A structured Q-sort was used, with 13 statements in the nonverbal, and 10 in the verbal, physical, social, and decision-making categories. The nonverbal elements (statements 1, 6, 12, 20, 32, 17, 11, 15, 21, 18, 42, 43, 2) can be typified by the statement: "I don't like it if they first touch me--like on the arm--when we just meet." An example statement about verbal elements (statements 10, 33, 22, 44, 23, 35, 45, 34, 46, 54) was: "I have a low opinion of a person if they use profanity." The physical context statements (24, 36, 3, 47, 25, 48, 37, 7, 9, 49) included: "I can tell a lot about whether I will like someone by their surroundings. I notice the way they decorate a room, the book they're reading that they left on the coffee-table, things like that."

Social context (statements 26, 38,27, 50, 39, 51, 28, 52, 40, 29) were indicated by such statements as "It is easier to meet people at parties or in groups." Finally, the decision-making category (statements 41, 30, 13, 4, 14, 31, 19, 16, 8, 5) included statements like: "If I'm meeting someone, I just know whether I like them or not. It just clicks." Although each category contained a similar number of statements, an additional three statements were allocated to the nonverbal category because of the apparent importance of the element in the Q concourse (see use of informal structure, Brenner, 1988, p. 13). The value of such a design is primarily to make sure essential elements in the process are included in the measure.

Data Collection

When given the second Q-sort entitled "Meeting People," subjects (n=88) were instructed that "these statements relate to communication and feelings when you first meet people. First, sort the statements into three stacks: agree (pleasure), disagree (unpleasure), and neutral (undecided)..." The respondents sorted statements according to their inter-relationships on an agree--disagree continuum. Instead of responding with one's degree of agreement to each statement, the response shows the relationship between statements.

Insert Table 1 about here

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by the most widely used computer program for Q analysis (Stephen, 1985, p. 204), Van Tubergen's computer program which uses varimax rotation. By looking at the descending array of z-scores and item descriptions for each type, the author examined how each type would ideally arrange statements from the most agree to most disagree. A synopsis of types was made based on study of their arrays and comparisons between types indicating items with z-scores greater or less than corresponding array z's.

Consider an application of an explanation of these procedures by Casey and Graham (1988) regarding interpretation:

> In Q-methodology, factor analysis features correlations between each pair of persons (rather than between each pair of

> items). Each person's array of scores on the [53, in the initial interaction study] statements is thus correlated with each other person's array, leading to a [53 x 88, in the initial interaction study] celled table [4664 cells] upon which the factor analysis is performed. Factor analysis bringing out the underlying similarities in these arrays thus clusters the subjects into like-minded groups (instead of clustering items into factors composed of items which evoke similar responses in the overall group of subjects)....We account for the clustered viewpoints (i.e., factors) by careful examination of the typal arrays of the factors, and here we benefit from the variety of statements from different realms of thought selected for the Q-sample. We reconstruct the Q-sort most typical of each factor, which is the pooled outlook of those subjects (and of other subjects contributing to that factor). This outlook reflects how an identifiable segment...actively thinks about the issue in the sense of wrestling with, assembling, and juxtaposing various ideas, notions, concepts, factual observations, epigrams, and symbols into a meaningful viewpoint. (p. 7)

As Brown described, the aim in Q is not "to generalize facts to broad populations, as a matter of statistical induction....It has always been the case in Q that generalizations apply to persons of the same type, irrespective of the numbers of persons belonging to the type" (Brown, 1986d, pp. 69-70).

Results and Discussion

In the final data analysis, there were 53 items and 88 variables analyzed. The correlation and principal components factoring phase was limited to six factors (see Table 2). All factor pair comparisons were requested, with bipolar splitting criterion at 25 and consensus item criterion at 1.00. The mean was 6.00, with a standard deviation of 2.56. The six chosen eigenvalues for the factors were: 17.75, 5.92, 4.29, 2.95, 2.77, 2.75. Using a six factor solution, the cumulative percentages of total variance are: 0.20, 0.27, 0.32, 0.35, 0.38, 0.41. In the varimax rotation, the solution was optimized after 12 iterations, with a final criterion of 1994.29. Factors 2, 3, and 6 were reflected. The lowest correlation was .29 between types 1 and 6; the highest

correlation was a .58 between types 3 and 5. These correlations indicate considerable overlap of types.

One statement item was repeated as a reliability measure. Some respondents thought it represented a mistake and made notation or removed one from the Q-sort. The correlation between statements 5 and 19 (based on z-scores for the six communicator types) was .99 (significance on one-tail was $p < .0003$).

Insert Table 2 about here

RQ1: Are there different communicator styles in the initial interaction stage of relational development? These data suggest six communicator styles when meeting people. There were six communicator styles: the "tentative communicator" who is rhetorically sensitive, the "deliberate communicator" who thinks he or she makes definitive judgments about first impressions, the "searching communicator" who is apprehensive, the "open communicator" who is nonjudgmental, the "particular communicator" who is critically judgmental, and "the awkward communicator" who is caring but lacks skills. A description of each style is given below.

The Tentative Communicator (type one) is the most prevalent style, with 50 subjects loading positively on this type. The person who uses this style is adaptable, indicating rhetorical sensitivity. Type one thinks subtle odors help to promote a friendly atmosphere. They find it is easier to meet people at parties or in groups. They try to be middle of the line and appeal to everyone. To these people, a friendly surrounding would have the curtains open, lots of light, plants, and bright colors. Their criteria for judging first impressions has changed over the years, and now they immediately know whether or not they will like people they meet. Other concerns for the context include their fondness for bright sunny days and liking to a person's things--the kinds of pictures they put on the wall, the furniture in their living room. Regarding nonverbals, they notice much about one's appearance, don't mind touching, and are not threatened by "open arms." The new person's first sentence is not too important, but they are concerned about speech and grammar, can easily find topics to talk about, and will easily modify their first impressions. Changeable type one is the most apt to know whether they

will like a new person. They are the most concerned about weak handshakes. They are the most concerned about environmental factors, think pleasant subtle odors (incense, cologne, food) promote a friendly atmosphere, and can tell much about whether they will like people by their surroundings. They are the most flexible type, in that they are sometimes wrong about first impressions, are less apt to stick with their first impressions than many people, and most apt to change their first impression later. They appear open-minded toward others, believing that a person who talks about himself or herself is selecting an appropriate topic. They are the most positive toward touching behaviors.

The Deliberate Communicator style (type two) represents a person who places emphasis on the importance of first impressions and never changes his or her mind about those impressions. These people think that if someone is unpleasant, it is hard to like them for some time. They do not like people who invade their space. People who care about their appearance and taking care of themselves are more dependable than others. They are not intimidated by someone wearing expensive clothes. They find it easy to talk to members of the opposite sex. Profanity, speech, and grammar mean little. First impressions are important. Stubborn type two makes a judgment and stays with it, never forgetting or changing or being wrong about first impressions. Of all the types, they least like to be touched. They are probably the most histrionic and manipulative type, in that they are the most composed and believe they are in control of nonverbal cues and can reveal the impression they want when first meeting someone. They are more critical of people of the same sex than those of opposite sex than other types are and find it easier to talk to the opposite sex than other types do. They have no desire to appeal to everyone and do not seem to care if everyone likes them. First impressions are important and should be a basis for judging people. They are more concerned about speech, grammar, and profanity than other types are. First impressions are more important to this type than any other. Five subjects loaded positively on this type, while three indicated an inverse relationship through their negative loadings.

The Searching Communicator (type three) believes people should not be judged by the initial impression that they give. They have a problem if someone they first meet is unpleasant or invades their space. They also try to be middle of the road, but they have difficulty finding topics to discuss.

In fact, this area seems to be the main problem because this type does not talk much when they first meet people. Speech and grammar are important. They don't want to shake the hand of someone who appears rude. They do not make judgments about trust based on appearance. This apprehensive type three is quiet, least in control of their nonverbals, and has trouble finding topics to discuss. They are more relaxed outdoors. They are more guarded, disclose less, and least likely to talk to strangers. They find it easier to talk to women and like familiar settings. They are most easily intimidated by expensive clothing. They believe a messy home or office means little. They attach less significance to nonverbal meanings. Only four subjects loaded positively on this type. Three subjects loaded negatively, indicating an open and nonapprehensive approach.

The Open Communicator (type four) seems most inclined to talk to strangers. They do not think people who wear bright colors appear to be calm and sensitive. They disagree with the statements: "It is easier to communicate with women." and "I have a harder time talking to the opposite sex than my own." The nonjudgmental type four believes more than other types that people should not be judged by the initial impressions. Their criteria for judging first impressions has changed most over the years, and they now have little expectation that it will turn out to be important. They are the most sensitive to having their space invaded. They find little importance in the meaning of gestures or the value of a sunny day. They are more open to people of differing class and age group. Two subjects loaded positively on this type.

The Particular Communicator (type five) will talk to someone while standing in line, like when at a football game or movie. They believe people who care about their appearance and taking care of themselves are more dependable than others. They have a low opinion of people who use profanity. They don't judge a person on their first sentence. First impressions are important. They notice appearance, but are not intimidated. The particular type five is most apt to have a low opinion of a person if they use profanity. They see people who are careful about their appearance and taking care of themselves as more dependable than others. In contrast to type four, they are most inclined to have a positive first impression of someone from the same class or age group. They are most able to talk to a stranger while standing in line. Their

favorite setting is a place where everyone is more relaxed and in a more honest mood, like in a church for example, or their own home or office. They are most likely to do things because they want to be liked. They are the most likely to forget first impressions. This type most disagrees more strongly with the statement "I am usually more concerned about what they think of me and take less time to read an accurate impression of them." They also disagree more with "People who put up obvious fake fronts during initial contact usually are the type of people who end up to be not worth knowing." They are most likely to notice appearance. They are least critical of people of the same sex.

The Awkward Communicator (type 6) does not like people who invade their space. A bright sunny day makes it easier for them to communicate. If someone is unpleasant, they find it hard to like them for some time. They think people who put up obvious fake fronts during initial contact usually are the type of people who end up to be not worth knowing. A messy home or office does not mean much. They do not seem concerned about profanity, a weak handshake, the first sentence, or people wearing expensive clothes. The awkward type six more than others has a harder time talking to the opposite sex than their own. If a person greets them initially with open arms, they feel more threatened than the other types. They perceive that they form stronger first impressions than others. They least trust people who want to talk about themselves or put up fake fronts. More than the others, they believe that people who avoid a handshake are socially rude. They most like a bright, sunny day. More than other types, they agree with the statement "It's sad to admit, but I think looks are important." They are the least intimidated by someone who wears expensive clothing. They perceive the importance of facial expressions. They are open and seem to care less than others about environmental factors. They are less likely than others to be concerned about the use of profanity, weak handshakes, and personal appearance.

RQ2: Do the general categories of verbal communication, nonverbal communication, context, and decision-making account for the nature of initial interaction? The ten most agree and the ten most disagree statements for each type were categorized according to the five categories of nonverbal, verbal, physical context, social context, and

decision-making. The use of the most extreme statements should indicate whether or not the five categories were effective in defining one's initial interaction. Of the 120 statements categorized, each person-type selected at least one statement from each category. A Chi-square for Independence was run to determine if there were significant differences between types in their use of the categories. There appears to be no significant difference between types (Chi-square 10.56, significance level .96, contingency coefficient .28, Cramer's Phi Prime .15). These data suggest that the five categories provide a viable definition of initial interaction for various communication types.

The five categories used here may or may not be the best way to define initial interaction. They are supported, however, by classic and recent research on the topic. In addition, the categories provide sufficient information to account for the six communicator styles. Further, these data suggest validity to a styles approach to initial interaction. With relatively few subjects loading on types 4, 5, and 6, however, the validity of all six styles is questionable. The identification of multiple approaches indicate patterns in communication that may or may not be supported by additional subjects or other groups of subjects.

The positive and negative loadings on types two and three may actually give considerable insight into initial interaction typologies. Although it seems possible that people are simply part of an apprehensive-nonapprehensive continuum, these data suggest otherwise. There appear to be two types of skilled communicators (one open-minded, one close-minded), an apprehensive, and an unskilled communicator. It would be useful to further investigate these types by comparing information about communication apprehension, differing contexts, and stages of relational development. Because one's initial interaction determines whether or not he or she will reach a secondary stage of relational development, the nature of one's initial interaction is extremely important. Are people the same types of communicators in all the various stages of relational development? Are problems in initial interaction simply another aspect to communication apprehension? Do individuals learn to use different behaviors in initial interaction--creating facades, limiting self-disclosure, quick judgments about

others--that represent skills that cannot be applied to later stages of relational development?

Such general or characteristic differences in approaches between the individuals in this study may indicate typologies that are different from other communication stages. Unlike many other Q studies, for example, there was only one consensus item (z-score 1.05): "A friendly surrounding would have the curtains open, with lots of light, plants, and bright colors." The lack of consensus items further suggests valid typologies. In interpreting Q-data, however, one should remember that Q-sorts "are not testable hypotheses: instead, they are hypothesis-inductive. Conditions of so-called mind are so complex that only after analysis, after the effect, can we determine which laws, if any, were at issue" (Stephenson, 1987, p. 25). Thus, the study leads us to the question: To what extent is our initial interaction influenced by our feeling-states? In addition, does the typical or "healthy" communicator have many negative and tentative feelings about the initial interaction that transpires when meeting people? This study represents a first step is taking a typological approach to the study of the initial stage of relational development. Although the person-types indicated by this study may not explain the feeling-states of everyone, they are indicative of these types. Their similarities and their differences give insight into understanding the subjective nature of initial communication interaction.

References

Arrindell, W. A. & Van der Ende, J. (1985). An empirical test of the utility of the observations-to-variables ratio in factor and components analysis. Applied Psychological Measurement, 9, 165-178.

Bormann, E. G. (1980). Communication theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, p. 60.

Brenner, D. J. (1988, October). Audience views of news media credibility: The Missouri yardstick. A paper presented at the national meeting of the Institute for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity, Columbia, MO.

Brewer, R. E., & Brewer, M. B. (1968). Attraction and accuracy of perception in dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8(2), 188-193.

Brown, S. R. (1971). The forced-free distinction in Q technique. The Journal of Educational Measurement, 8, 283-287.

Brown, S. R. (1986a). Q technique and method: Principles and procedures. In W. D. Berry & M. S. Lewis-Beck (Ed.) New tools for social scientists: Advances and applications in research methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Brown, S. R. (1986b). Review of Kerlinger's 3rd Edition. Operant Subjectivity, 10(1), 23-24.

Brown, S. R. (1986c). On the ratio of Q sorts to statements. Operant Subjectivity, 9(3), 96-98.

Brown, S. R. (1986d, January). Voices of authority. Operant Subjectivity, 9(2), 69-70.

Brown, S. R. (1986e, January). The forced distribution. Operant Subjectivity, 9(2), 63-64.

Brown, S. R. (1987b, April). A challenge through psychnet. Operant Subjectivity, 10(3), 98-99.

Brown, S. R. (1988). The ipsative sidetrack. Operant Subjectivity, 11(2), 66-67.

Bull, P., & Connelly, G. (1985, Fall). Body movement and emphasis in speech. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 9(3), 167-187.

Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62(3), 713-715.

Byrne, D., & Blaylock, B. (1963). Similarity and assumed similarity of attitudes between husbands and wives. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(6), 636-640.

Casey, G., & Graham, B. L. (1988, October). Attitudes towards recruitment for the United States Supreme Court: Bork, Ginsburg, and Kennedy. A paper presented at the national meeting of the Institute for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity.

Clore, G. L., & Baldridge, B. (1968). Interpersonal attraction: The role of agreement and topic interest. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9(4), 340-346.

DePaulo, B. M., Hoover, C. W., Webb, W., Kenny, D. A., Oliver, P. V. (1987). Accuracy of person perception: Do people know what kinds of impressions they convey? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(2), 303-315.

Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1984). A typology approach to marital interaction: Recent theory and research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advanced in experimental social psychology (Vol. 18, pp. 1-47). New York: Academic Press.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., Jandt, F., Myrick, F. L., Edgar, T. (1990). Gay and lesbian couple relationships. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago.

Gifford, R. (1981). Sociability: Traits, settings, and interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41(2), 340-347.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order. New York: Basic Books.

Gorden, W. I., Infante, D. A., & Braun, A. A. (1986). Communicator style: Is the metaphor appropriate? Communication Research Reports, 3, 13-19.

Gurevitch, Z. D. (1988). The other side of dialogue: On making the other strange and the experience of otherness. American Journal of Sociology, 93(5),1199.

Harrigan, J. A. (1985, April). Listeners' body movements and speaking turns. Communication Research, 12(2), 233-250.

Hart, R., Carlson, R., & Eadie, W. (1980). Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. Communication Monographs, 47, 1-22.

Infante, D. A., & Gorden, W. I. (1981). Similarities and differences in the communicator styles of superiors and subordinates: Relations to subordinate satisfaction. Communication Quarterly, 30, 67-71.

Kleinke, C. L., Meeker, F. B., & Staneski, R. A. (1986). Preference for opening lines: Comparing ratings by men and women. Sex Roles, 15(11-12), 585-600.

Knapp, M. L. (1984). Interpersonal communication and human relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mauldin, C. R. (1987, November). A segmentation study of attitudes about advertising. A paper presented at the national meeting of the Institute for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity, Columbia, MO.

Maxwell, B. M., & Cook, M. W. (1985, June). Postural congruence and judgments of liking and perceived similarity. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 14(1), 20-26.

McKeown, B. F., & Thomas, D. B. (1988). Q Methodology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nofsinger, R. E., Jr. (1975). The demand ticket: A conversational device for getting the floor. Speech Monographs, 42, 1-9.

Quigley-Fernandez, B., Malkis, F. S., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1985, February). Effects of first impressions and reliability of promises on trust and cooperation. British Journal of Social Psychology, 24(1), 29-36.

Norton, R. W. (1978). Foundations of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

Norton, R. (1983). Communication style: Theory, application, and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 64-72.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Communication: Apprehension, Avoidance, and effectiveness. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.

Riggio, R. E., & Friedman, H. S. (1986). Impression formation: The role of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(2), 421-427.

Rodin, M. (1982). Non-engagement, failure to engage, and disengagement. In S. Duck (ed.), Personal relationships 4: Dissolving personal relationships. New York: Academic Press, pp. 31-49.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In J. Schenkein, ed., Studies in the organization of conversational interaction. New York: Academic Press, 7-56.

Stephen, T. D. (1985, Summer). Q methodology in communication science: An introduction. Communication Quarterly, 33, 193-208.

Stephenson, W. (1953). The study of behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1967). The play theory of mass communication. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1987, October). The science of ethics: 1. The single case. Operant Subjectivity, 11(1), 10-31.

Stephenson, W. (1989). Quantum theory of subjectivity. Integrative Psychiatry, 6, 180-181.

Suman, H. C., & Sethi, A. S. (1985, September). Interpersonal attraction as a function of proportional similarity in personality. Journal of Psychological Researches, 29(3), 141-148.

Sunnafrank, M. (1985, Winter). Attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction during early communicative relationships: A research note on the generalizability of findings to opposite-sex relationships. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 49(1), 73-80.

Sunnafrank, M. (1986, Spring). Communicative influences on perceived similarity and attraction: An expansion of the interpersonal goals perspective. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50(2), 158-170.

Sunnafrank, M. J. & Miller, G. R. (1981). The role of initial conversations in determining attraction to similar and dissimilar strangers. Human Communication Research, 8, 16-25.

Tutzauer, F., & Roloff, M. E. (1988). Communication processes leading to integrative agreements: three paths to joint benefits. Communication Research, 15, 360-380.

Van Tubergen, N. (1975). QUANAL user's guide (Computer program manual). Lexington, KY: Dept. of Communication, University of Kentucky.

Table 1: Q-Sort Distribution

	Most Disagree									Most Agree
Value	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
Frequency	2	3	5	6	7	7	7	6	5	3	2

n = 53	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

Table 2: Principal Components Factor Matrix

Communality	Variable	Factor Loadings					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0.408	1	**0.515**	-0.054	-0.261	-0.246	-0.104	0.003
0.340	2	**0.489**	0.138	0.090	-0.082	-0.106	0.235
0.242	3	0.334	0.104	-0.120	0.302	0.119	0.020
0.324	4	**0.551**	-0.077	0.068	-0.056	0.060	-0.057
0.316	5	0.290	-0.334	0.043	0.224	-0.198	0.172
0.344	6	**0.486**	-0.191	0.109	0.052	-0.231	0.054
0.505	7	0.266	**-0.648**	0.008	-0.020	0.008	0.120
0.465	8	**0.390**	-0.237	0.149	-0.292	0.217	-0.319
0.291	9	0.291	0.301	-0.227	-0.235	-0.093	-0.018
0.548	10	**0.679**	-0.077	0.261	-0.038	-0.106	-0.013
0.335	11	0.347	0.039	0.113	-0.150	-0.128	-0.402
0.535	12	**0.561**	0.405	0.170	0.005	0.142	0.091
0.316	13	0.345	-0.150	-0.245	-0.147	0.086	0.292
0.522	14	0.405	**-0.548**	-0.124	0.160	0.031	-0.126
0.656	15	**0.562**	-0.448	0.106	0.346	-0.012	-0.094
0.568	16	**0.626**	0.008	-0.100	0.152	0.294	0.237
0.537	17	**0.500**	-0.079	-0.367	-0.311	0.038	0.220
0.129	18	0.092	-0.173	0.164	0.023	-0.251	-0.006
0.522	19	**0.590**	-0.103	-0.326	-0.042	-0.108	-0.211
0.467	20	**0.423**	-0.348	0.391	0.028	0.112	-0.017
0.563	21	**0.588**	-0.367	-0.077	-0.133	-0.226	-0.085
0.176	22	0.102	-0.043	0.085	-0.137	0.167	-0.332
0.372	23	0.303	-0.078	-0.116	**0.408**	0.242	-0.188
0.338	24	0.363	**0.386**	-0.094	0.187	-0.028	-0.113
0.685	25	**0.590**	0.233	-0.218	0.434	-0.170	0.130
0.270	26	0.095	0.101	**0.403**	-0.249	0.116	-0.110
0.348	27	0.246	-0.030	**0.462**	-0.081	0.114	-0.230
0.441	28	**0.533**	-0.048	0.099	-0.202	0.040	0.320
0.543	29	**0.536**	-0.434	-0.063	-0.167	-0.126	-0.138
0.555	30	**0.473**	0.233	-0.249	-0.343	-0.292	-0.111

0.375	31	**0.419**	0.193	-0.337	-0.087	-0.031	0.201
0.426	32	0.217	0.339	**-0.429**	-0.196	0.196	0.057
0.287	33	0.240	-0.319	0.032	-0.216	-0.267	-0.094
0.202	34	0.242	-0.082	0.134	-0.308	-0.151	0.02
0.449	35	**0.597**	-0.242	0.147	0.051	-0.096	0.022
0.221	36	**0.434**	-0.025	-0.018	-0.015	0.177	-0.021
0.137	37	0.037	-0.220	0.088	-0.073	0.259	0.086
0.370	38	**0.527**	0.090	-0.250	0.063	0.126	-0.047
0.384	39	0.332	-0.296	-0.261	0.133	-0.175	0.264
0.157	40	0.290	0.067	0.183	-0.141	-0.027	-0.117
0.380	41	**0.409**	0.066	-0.273	0.135	-0.338	0.035
0.592	42	**0.687**	0.308	0.057	0.140	0.009	0.047
0.659	43	**0.645**	0.457	0.045	0.005	0.043	0.175
0.549	44	**0.598**	0.411	0.118	0.034	-0.017	0.089
0.465	45	**0.465**	-0.005	-0.268	0.113	0.236	-0.330
0.674	46	**0.618**	0.270	-0.431	-0.123	-0.080	0.109
0.457	47	0.321	0.281	0.308	0.262	-0.325	-0.080
0.392	48	0.161	0.183	**0.392**	0.279	-0.305	0.090
0.356	49	0.354	0.119	**-0.436**	0.140	0.040	-0.077
0.262	50	**0.397**	0.148	-0.048	-0.211	-0.091	-0.166
0.475	51	0.280	0.056	0.241	-0.210	**0.533**	0.084
0.481	52	**0.436**	0.244	-0.178	0.123	0.403	0.151
0.345	53	**0.507**	-0.001	0.193	-0.042	-0.045	0.218
0.363	54	0.235	**-0.542**	0.066	-0.070	0.041	0.051
0.366	55	0.293	**-0.481**	-0.200	0.057	-0.031	-0.064
0.446	56	**0.454**	-0.314	0.032	-0.163	0.212	0.263
0.373	57	0.359	**-0.454**	-0.156	0.056	0.017	-0.098
0.587	58	**0.561**	-0.408	0.203	-0.037	0.055	0.246
0.433	59	**0.439**	0.319	0.334	0.101	-0.090	0.093
0.442	60	**0.561**	0.060	0.269	-0.166	-0.118	-0.099
0.202	61	0.353	0.073	-0.148	0.178	-0.114	0.076
0.605	62	**0.620**	0.164	0.128	-0.136	-0.123	0.379
0.448	63	**0.511**	0.169	0.368	-0.151	-0.005	0.028
0.499	64	**0.516**	0.210	0.183	-0.106	0.378	-0.032
0.603	65	**0.585**	0.202	-0.116	-0.363	-0.265	0.062
0.365	66	**0.419**	0.070	-0.252	-0.162	-0.270	0.149

0.393	67	0.549	-0.030	0.250	0.122	-0.093	-0.070
0.428	68	0.418	0.435	-0.175	0.083	0.074	-0.145
0.480	69	0.501	-0.242	0.132	-0.111	0.198	0.319
0.643	70	0.688	-0.300	0.236	0.020	0.046	0.141
0.525	71	0.630	0.072	0.086	-0.083	0.153	-0.291
0.509	72	0.628	0.085	0.040	0.082	0.310	0.056
0.418	73	0.323	-0.044	-0.102	0.275	-0.306	
0.398	74	0.307	-0.017	-0.355	-0.169	0.212	-0.323
0.358	75	0.452	0.070	-0.093	0.334	0.035	-0.166
0.473	76	0.327	0.228	0.441	-0.003	-0.165	-0.304
0.518	77	0.609	0.160	0.139	0.197	0.123	-0.217
0.424	78	0.271	-0.270	-0.168	0.440	0.113	0.210
0.204	79	0.051	-0.239	-0.061	-0.328	-0.171	-0.065
0.696	80	0.620	-0.376	-0.212	0.134	-0.041	-0.325
0.266	81	0.270	-0.270	-0.094	0.129	-0.218	-0.217
0.543	82	0.564	0.299	0.155	0.162	-0.194	-0.218
0.155	83	0.102	-0.144	-0.298	0.045	-0.152	-0.102
0.338	84	0.349	-0.245	0.225	0.255	0.128	0.155
0.459	85	0.654	0.013	0.124	-0.077	0.048	-0.091
0.428	86	0.472	0.408	-0.070	0.073	-0.144	0.088
0.114	87	0.188	-0.026	0.062	0.153	-0.084	-0.209
0.162	88	0.195	0.312	0.075	0.011	0.071	-0.125

($p<.01<.354$)

Appendix A: Meeting People Q Sort

Item Descriptions

with Typal Array Z's for Each Factor

	N's for each type: 23	22	17	11	9	5
1. People who avoid a handshake are socially rude.	-0.6	-0.1	-1.7	0.2	0.2	1.0
2. I believe I'm in control of my nonverbal cues and can reveal the impression I want when first meeting someone.	0.2	0.9	-0.3	0.0	0.2	0.2
3. I prefer meeting someone in my territory--my home or office.	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.6	1.2	0.5
4. My criteria for judging first impressions has changed over the years.	1.4	0.9	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.2
5. People shouldn't be judged by the initial impression that they give.	0.4	-0.3	2.4	2.4	1.1	0.1
6. I don't like it if they first touch me --like on the arm--when we just meet.	-1.5	1.0	-0.4	0.1	0.6	0.6
7. My favorite setting is a place where we are all more relaxed and in a more honest mood, like in a church for example.	-0.0	-0.1	0.2	-0.0	1.1	-0.7
8. People who put up obvious fake fronts during initial contact usually are the type of people who end up to be not worth knowing.	0.3	0.6	0.2	-0.0	-0.8	1.5
9. A friendly surrounding would have the curtains open, lots of light, plants, and bright colors.	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8
10. A person's speech and grammar seldom affect my first impression.	1.5	-2.2	-1.6	-0.6	-0.5	-0.1
11. People who use a lot of gestures in communication are more imaginative or creative.	0.5	0.7	-0.1	-0.4	0.3	-0.3
12. I only notice the extremes of a person's appearance, such as bad						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	odor or too much make-up.						
13.	I think I form stronger first impressions and tend to stick with them more than many people do.	-0.9	-0.1	-0.7	-0.8	-0.6	1.1
14.	I've only been wrong a few times with my first impression of a person.	-0.6	0.9	-0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0
15.	It's sad to admit, but I think looks are important because, often times, that's all you've got to go by when you meet someone.	1.4	-0.2	-0.4	0.1	-1.9	-0.1
16.	First impressions are never forgotten.	-0.1	1.9	-0.3	0.8	-0.4	0.7
17.	If a person greets me initially with open arms, I feel very threatened.	-1.8	-0.4	-0.9	0.1	-1.0	0.9
18.	I do not like people who talk in my face and invade my space.	0.4	2.0	1.3	2.4	1.1	1.9
19.	People shouldn't be judged by the initial impressions they give.	0.6	-0.5	2.3	2.5	1.1	-0.1
20.	People who care about their appearance and taking care of themselves are more dependable than others.	0.8	1.4	-0.9	-0.4	1.9	-1.3
21.	I can tell by someone's outward appearance whether or not they can be trusted.	-0.7	-0.3	-2.1	-1.1	-0.9	-0.3
22.	I have a low opinion of a person if they use profanity.	1.1	0.7	1.2	0.8	0.5	-0.1
23.	I always try to maintain secrets because not sure how people will perceive my openness.	0.2	-0.5	0.8	-0.3	0.0	-0.8
24.	I can tell a lot about whether I will like someone by their surroundings. I notice the way they decorate a room, the book they're reading that they left on the coffee-table, things like that.	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.1	-1.0	-1.0
25.	I feel most comfortable talking with someone in a familiar setting--whether it's my house or a restaurant--where	1.1	0.7	1.2	0.8	0.5	-0.1

	I feel like I have some control over the conversation and the setting, and I'm not "locked in."						
26.	I tend to form better first impressions of people that are from the same class and age group as me.	-0.5	0.8	-0.2	-1.8	1.2	0.1
27.	It is usually hard for me to change my first impression of someone after I see different sides of them after being with them for a while.	-1.7	0.3	-0.8	-1.6	-1.3	-1.7
28.	It is a challenge to meet new people and remain composed.	0.0	-0.7	1.1	0.5	-0.7	0.5
29.	On first encounter we do things because we want to be liked.	0.6	-1.1	0.0	-0.3	0.7	0.7
30.	If someone is unpleasant to me when I first meet them, I find it hard to like them for some time.	0.8	2.2	1.7	1.2	1.5	1.6
31.	I am more critical of people of the same sex than those of opposite sex when I first meet them.	0.8	1.2	0.5	1.1	-1.2	-0.2
32.	I hate weak handshakes because they mean the person really doesn't want to meet you.	0.8	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	-0.5	-1.6
33.	Words reveal more than facial expressions, but both are important.	-0.2	-0.5	0.3	-0.5	0.1	-1.0
34.	Sometime I talk too much when I first meet people.	0.3	-1.3	-1.4	1.0	-1.0	-1.0
35.	I'm not sure I trust those who at first begin talking about themselves rather than leaving the door open to discussion.	-0.8	0.6	-0.3	-0.8	-0.3	1.1
36.	I like being able to see a person's things--the kinds of pictures they put on the wall, the furniture in their living room, their tastes--when I meet them.	1.2	0.6	0.2	0.2	-0.1	-0.8

37.	I communicate better outdoors, because there is more to talk about.	-0.8	-0.7	0.4	-1.1	-0.7	0.3
38.	I try to be middle of the line and appeal to everyone.	1.5	-0.3	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.6
39.	It is easier to communicate with women.	-0.3	-0.8	-0.1	-1.4	-0.3	-0.9
40.	First impressions are seldom important to me.	-1.1	-1.9	-1.0	0.8	-1.6	-1.2
41.	If I'm meeting someone, I just know whether I like them or not. It just clicks.	1.3	0.3	-0.2	-0.4	0.6	0.6
42.	People who wear bright colors appear to be calm and sensitive.	-1.0	-0.8	-1.1	-1.3	-0.0	-1.6
43.	It's harder for me to speak with someone wearing a five hundred dollar suit than one wearing a hundred and fifty dollar one.	-1.1	-1.4	-0.6	-0.7	-1.7	-1.8
44.	If someone uses swear words it doesn't make any difference to me.	-0.1	-1.9	-0.5	-0.4	-1.1	0.6
45.	I usually judge people on their first sentence--hardly ever on an entire conversation when we first meet.	-1.8	-1.5	-1.9	-2.3	-1.6	-2.3
46.	I have to think hard to find topics to talk about when I first meet someone.	-1.7	-0.4	1.3	-0.1	-0.4	0.0
47.	A home or office that is messy points to an irresponsible person.	-0.6	-0.4	-1.7	-0.1	-1.1	-1.3
48.	A bright sunny day makes it easier for me to communicate.	1.3	-0.2	0.7	-0.3	0.2	1.7
49.	Pleasant subtle odors (incense, cologne, food) promote a friendly atmosphere.	1.8	0.6	0.7	0.7	1.5	0.0
50.	I am usually more concerned about what they think of me and take less time to read an accurate impression of them.	-0.5	-0.8	-0.2	-1.0	-1.1	-0.2
51.	I have a harder time talking to the opposite sex than my own.	-0.9	-1.7	-0.4	-1.5	-0.4	1.1

52. It is easier to meet people at parties or in groups.	1.7	-0.1	1.3	0.2	0.8	1.2
53. I will talk to someone while standing in line like when at a football game or movie.	1.0	-0.0	-0.6	1.3	2.2	0.8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE